UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/798,718 | 03/11/2004 | Baochuan Guo | 27433/04015 | 4996 |

24024 7590 08/25/2006

CALFEE HALTER & GRISWOLD, LLP
800 SUPERIOR AVENUE
SUITE 1400
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| CHO, DAN SUNG C | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 1634 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/798,718 | GUO, BAOCHUAN | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Dan-Sung C. Cho | 1634 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *June 19, 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *18-22, 24-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *18-22 and 24-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *Mar 13, 2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the papers filed 6/19/2006. Currently, claims 18-22, 24-36 are pending.

2. Any rejections not reiterated in this action have been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments to the claims or arguments.

A) The amendments to the claims which require use of an allele specific oligonucleotide prior to amplification overcomes the Fanning rejection previously of record.

3. This action contains new grounds of rejection necessitated by amendment.

### *Election/Restrictions*

4. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, Claims 1-22, in a telephone conversation with the applicant's representative, Sarah Eurek, on 11/18/2005 and on the paper filed 6/19/2006 is acknowledged. Applicant canceled claims 1-17 and 23, amended 18 and added new claims 24-36.

### *Priority*

5. This application claims benefit of 60/453,516 filed on 3/12/2003.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 24, 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Landers (herein referred to as Landers, US Patent US 6,844,154 B2, Jan. 18, 2005, filed Mar. 30, 2001).

9. With regard to claims 24 reciting "...non-enriched allelic variant is present, the enriched allelic variant is present in an amount that is from 1.5 to 100 times greater than the amount of the non-enriched allelic variant...", Landers teaches obtaining an enriched nucleic acid fraction that contains more of one allelic variant of a haplotype of two SNPs by hybridization to a probe on a surface that is specific for one particular allele of one SNP of a haplotype ( Figure 1, 2, 3A and 3B; column 2, lines 38-63; column 3, lines 18-19 and 47-68; column 9, lines 22-32 and 45-51; column 16, lines 30-50). Landers teaches that this complex is hybridized with a probe that specifically binds to a particular allele of the other SNP of the haplotype and genotyping involves

detecting a signal from this probe which indicates the presence of particular alleles in both SNPS of the haplotype (see Figure 1, 2, 3A and 3B; column 2, lines 38-63; column 9, lines 45-51; column 16, lines 30-50; column 26, lines 60-67). Landers teaches that the presence of a second allelic-variant haplotype, which would be at a lower level in the enriched fraction of the first haplotype, can be detected by analogous hybridization with a probe on a surface that specifically binds to a different allele of the first SNP of the haplotype and detection with a probe that specifically binds to an allele of the second SNP of the haplotype (Figures 1, 2, 3A and 3B; column 26, lines 60-67; column 27, lines 1-8).

10. With regard to claims 32 reciting "...the enriched allelic variant is present in an amount that is from 2 to 30 times greater than the amount of the non-enriched allelic variant....", Landers teaches enrichment of nucleic acid fraction that contains more of one allelic variant of a haplotype of two SNPs by hybridization to a probe on a surface that is specific for one particular.

11. With regard to claims 33 reciting "...the nucleic acid fraction contains nucleic acid molecules that do not hybridize to the allele-specific hybridization probe...:, Landers teaches purification or isolation of ASO-captured allele by "separating the labeled nucleic acid samples into single nucleic acid molecules, detecting the presence of absence of the first, second, third and fourth labeled probes" (column 4, lines 5-9). Landers further teaches a bi-phasic allele specific oligonucleotide hybridization techniques where (1) a SNP1 allele –specific oligonucleotide (ASO) is used to capture a

SNP1/nucleic acid sample complex; (2) Excess un-hybridized DNA is removed (column 14 lines 45-65).

12. With regard to claims 36 reciting "...the enriched allelic variant is present in an amount that is from 3 to 6 times greater than the amount of the non-enriched allelic variant...", Landers teaches obtaining an enriched nucleic acid fraction that contains more of one allelic variant of a haplotype of two SNPs by hybridization to a probe on a surface that is specific for one particular.

13. With regard to claims 27 and 28 reciting "...the subject is diploid" and "the sample is a nucleic acid...", Landers teaches using RNA, cDNA or gnomic DNA which are diploid (claims 20-22).

14. With regard to claims 29 reciting "...the allele-specific hybridization probe is attached to a solid support or to a first binding molecule that is capable of binding to a second binding molecule that is attached to a solid support, and wherein the nucleic acid sample and the allele-specific hybridization probe are contacted under hybridization conditions that allow the allele-specific hybridization probe to preferentially hybridize with one allele of the first selected SNP site.....", Landers teaches using direct or indirect avidin-biotin coupling techniques (column 9 lines 4-21).

15. With regard to claims 30 reciting "...the allele-specific hybridization probe is attached to a solid support or to a first binding molecule that is capable of binding to a second binding molecule that is attached to a solid support, and wherein the nucleic acid sample and the allele-specific hybridization probe are contacted under hybridization conditions that allow the allele-specific hybridization probe to preferentially

hybridize with one allele of the first selected SNP site.....", Landers teaches using direct or indirect avidin-biotin coupling techniques (column 9 lines 4-21; column 18 lines 44-61).

16. With regard to claims 31 reciting "...the first binding molecule is biotin streptavidin and said second binding molecule is streptavidin or biotin.....", Landers teaches using biding partners such as avidin, biotin, streptavidin, antibody and antigen (column 9 lines 4-21; column 18 lines 44-61).

17. With regard to claims 34 reciting "... the allele-specific hybridization probe is an oligonucleotide, a peptide nucleic acid or a locked nucleic acid.....", Landers teaches using oligonucleotide (claims1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 12, where ASO is Allele-Specific Oligonucleotide).

18. With regard to claims 35 reciting "...allele-specific hybridization probe is an oligonucleotide that is attached to a first binding molecule and the nucleic acid sample is contacted with both the allele-specific hybridization probe and a competitor oligonucleotide that hybridizes to the other allele of the first selected SNP site and that is not attached to the first binding molecule", Landers teaches that cold competitor oligos that hybridize to the other allele of the SNP site and not attached to a binding partner such as biotin or avidin (claim 15', column 27, lines 10-24 of Landers).

19. Landers does not specifically teach the range of enrichment after ASO-mediated selection. However given the method steps used by Landers which appear to be the method steps of the instant application the range of enrichment would inherently be the same.

20. However, per MPEP 2144.05, where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation and it is the normal desire of scientists and artisans to improve on what is already generally known. Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made improve the method of haplotype analysis taught by Landers through routine experimentation to provide optimal or workable ranges, such as where the enriched allelic variant is present in an amount that is from 1.5 to 100 times or more specifically 2-30, greater than the amount of the non-enriched allelic variant. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to have enriched the sample 2-30 times to allow increased sensitivity to ensure results of haplotype analysis did not show false results.

***Response to Arguments***

21. The response traverses the rejection. Applicant's arguments filed 6/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive.

22. The Applicant asserts that Landers teaches nucleic acids be fixed on a solid support (page 8 paragraph 2) before allele specific hybridization occurs. The response further asserts the instant invention does not require amplification of all the polymorphic loci on nucleic acid being haplotyped. This argument has been reviewed but is not persuasive. The instant claims do not require amplification. Moreover the instant claims are not drawn to a method which excludes amplification of all polymorphic sites. Landers teaches all the limitation of the claims.

23. Applicant asserts that Landers does not teach using a probe specific for a particular allele to provide an enriched fraction and analyzing second SNP site. Landers teaches a method for "haplotyping by analyzing a genotype of a first SNP of a polymorphic locus of a nucleic acid within a sample in solution by...detecting the present or absence of a first labeled probe...separating the nucleic acid samples based in the genotype of the first SNP, and analyzing a second SNP of the polymorphic locus of the separated nucleic acid samples to identify the haplotype of the nucleic acid." (column 3, lines 49-58). Once the first ASO probe isolates nucleic acid this is enrichment. The subsequent analysis allows identity and relative amounts to be analyzed. On Figure 5, for example, haplotyping results show #1 and #2 individuals with A-G homozygotes, #3 individual with G-G and A-G heterozygotes and #4 individual with A-A homozygote haplotypes. Note on the Figures 4 and 5 Y-axis is "signal strength" with numerical intervals that can be used to calculate relative amounts. Therefore Landers teaches all the limitations of instant claims.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 (a)**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 18-22 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landers (US Patent US 6,844,154 B2, Jan. 18, 2005, filed Mar. 30,

2001) in view of Sorenson (herein referred to as Sorenson, US Patent 6,020,124, 02/2000).

25. With regard to Claim 18 reciting "...preferentially extracting one of said two allelic variants from an original nucleic acid sample comprising said two allelic variants of said chromosome or chromosomal fragment to provide an enriched sample in which the level of the preferentially extracted allelic variant is from 2 to 30 times greater than the level of the allelic variant that is not preferentially extracted from the sample by contacting said chromosome chromosomal fragment with an allele-specific hybridization probe ...", Landers teaches obtaining an enriched nucleic acid fraction that contains more of one allelic variant of a haplotype with ASO ( Figure 1, 2, 3A and 3B; column 2, lines 38-63; column 3, lines 18-19 and 47-68; column 9, lines 22-32 and 45-51; column 16, lines 30-50). Landers also teaches that this complex is hybridized with a probe that specifically binds to a particular allele of the other SNP of the haplotype and genotyping involves detecting a signal from this probe which indicates the presence of particular alleles in both SNPS of the haplotype (see Figure 1, 2, 3A and 3B; column 2, lines 38-63; column 9, lines 45-51; column 16, lines 30-50; column 26, lines 60-67). Landers teaches that the presence of a second allelic-variant haplotype, which would be at a lower level in the enriched fraction of the first haplotype, can be detected by analogous hybridization with a probe on a surface that specifically binds to a different allele of the first SNP of the haplotype and detection with a probe that specifically binds to an allele of the second SNP of the haplotype (Figures 1, 2, 3A and 3B; column 26, lines 60-67; column 27, lines 1-8).

26. Landers does not teach a method of haplotyping which involves amplifying the nucleic acids in the enriched nucleic acid fraction prior to identifying the alleles of interest.

27. However, Sorenson teaches that prior to determining the alleles present in a particular nucleic acid, the nucleic acid sample can be amplified with a common amplification step by PCR to amplify wild-type and mutant forms of the DNA to increase the amount of DNA from which the mutant allele can be detected (see column 2, lines 35-39 of Sorenson). Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve the method of haplotype identification taught by Landers to include PCR amplification of the nucleic acids in the enriched nucleic acid fraction prior to identifying the alleles of interest by using an amplification that would amplify all of the allelic variants in the same proportion in view of the teachings of Sorenson.

28. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to improve the method of haplotype identification taught by Landers to include PCR amplification of the nucleic acids in the enriched nucleic acid fraction prior to identifying the alleles of interest by using an amplification that would amplify all of the allelic variants in the same proportion because Sorenson teaches that a common amplification step prior to specific allele identification increases the amount of DNA from which mutant alleles can be detected.

29. Landers in view of Sorenson does not teach methods of haplotype analysis in which the level of the preferentially extracted allelic variant is from 2 to 30 times greater than the level of the allelic variant that is not preferentially extracted.

30. However, per MPEP 2144.05, where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation and it is the normal desire of scientists and artisans to improve on what is already generally known. Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made improve the method of haplotype analysis taught by Landers in view of Sorenson through routine experimentation to provide optimal or workable ranges, such as the level of the preferentially extracted allelic variant is from 2 to 30 times greater than the level of the allelic variant that is not preferentially extracted (claim 18) in view of Landers.

31. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to improve the method of haplotype analysis taught by Landers in view of Sorenson through routine experimentation to provide optimal or workable ranges, such as where the level of the preferentially extracted allelic variant is specifically from 2 to 30 times greater than the level of the non-preferentially extracted for the purpose of obtaining the optimal range to practice the method of haplotyping taught by Landers in view of Sorenson.

32. With regard to claim 19 reciting "...one of said allelic variants is preferentially extracted from said original nucleic acid sample by a solid phase extraction technique...", Landers teaches obtaining nucleic acid fraction that contains more of one allelic variant of a haplotype of two SNPs by using allele-specific oligonucleotide hybridization technique and solid phase extraction (claims 1-3, 12 and 16; Figure3; column 26, lines 34-45). Landers teaches that the presence of a second allelic-variant

haplotype, which would be at lower level in the enriched fraction of the first haplotype, can be detected by analogous hybridization with a probe on a solid support that specifically binds to a different allele of the first SNP of the haplotype and detection with a probe that specifically binds to an allele of the second SNP of the haplotype (claims 1-3, 12, and 16., see Figures 3 and 5 and column 26, lines 60-67 and column 27, lines 1-8).

33. With regard to Claim 20 reciting "...allele-specific hybridization probe is an oligonucleotide that is attached to a first binding molecule, and said solid phase extraction technique also employs a competitor oligonucleotide that hybridizes to the other allele of the heterozygotes SNP site and that is not attached to the first binding molecule ...", Landers teaches that cold competitor oligos that hybridize to the other allele of the SNP site that is being detected can be added with the labeled allele-specific probes (claim 15, column 27, lines 10-24 of Landers).

34. With regard to Claim 21 reciting "...the genotypes of the chromosome or chromosomal fragments are determined before one allelic variant of the chromosome or chromosomal fragments is extracted from the original nucleic acid sample. ...", Landers teaches purification or isolation of ASO-captured allele by "separating the labeled nucleic acid samples into single nucleic acid molecules, detecting the presence of absence of the first, second, third and fourth labeled probes" (column 4, lines 5-9). Landers further teaches a bi-physic allele specific oligonucleotide hybridization techniques where (1) a SNP1 allele –specific oligonucleotide (ASO) is used to capture a SNP1/nucleic acid sample complex; (2) Excess un-hybridized DNA is removed to purify

the first SNP1 allele-specific DNA; (3) SNP2 is analyzed. (column 14 lines 45-65). Landers further teaches a method in which after the first SNP has been identified, the DNA molecules containing the first allele are in a separate container from the DNA samples containing the second allele (column 16 lines 30-34).

35. With regard to claim 22 reciting "...the amount of the enriched allelic variant in the enriched nucleic acid fraction is from 3 to 10 times greater than the amount of the non-enriched allelic variant in the nucleic acid sample....", Landers teaches purification or isolation of ASO-captured allele (column 4, lines 5-9). Sorenson teaches that prior to determining the alleles present in a particular nucleic acid, the nucleic acid sample can be amplified with a common amplification step by PCR to amplify wild-type and mutant forms of the DNA to increase the amount of DNA from which the mutant allele can be detected (see column 2, lines 35-39 of Sorenson). Landers in view of Sorenson do not teach methods of haplotype analysis in which the level of the preferentially extracted allelic variant is from 3 to 10 times greater than the level of the allelic variant that is not preferentially extracted.

36. However, per MPEP 2144.05, where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation and it is the normal desire of scientists and artisans to improve on what is already generally known. Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made improve the method of haplotype analysis taught by Landers in view of Sorenson through routine experimentation to provide optimal or workable ranges, such as the level of the

preferentially extracted allelic variant is from 3 to 10 times greater than the non-enriched allele.

37. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to improve the method of haplotype analysis taught by Landers in view of Sorenson through routine experimentation to provide optimal or workable ranges, such as where the level of the preferentially extracted allelic variant is from 3 to 30 times greater than the level of the non-enriched allele for the purpose of obtaining the optimal range to practice the method of haplotyping taught by Landers in view of Sorenson.

38. With regard to claim 25 reciting "...the nucleic acid fraction is combined

39. under polymerase chain reaction amplification conditions with one or more primer sets, ...", Landers teaches purification or isolation of ASO-captured allele (column 4, lines 5-9). Sorenson teaches that prior to determining the alleles present in a particular nucleic acid, the nucleic acid sample can be amplified with a common amplification step by PCR to amplify wild-type and mutant forms of the DNA to increase the amount of DNA from which the mutant allele can be detected (see column 2, lines 35-39 of Sorenson).

40. With regard to Claim 26 reciting "...primer sets do not hybridize to portions of the nucleic acid that flank the first selected SNP site....", Landers teaches obtaining an enriched nucleic acid fraction with ASO ( Figure 1, 2, 3A and 3B; column 2, lines 38-63; column 3, lines 18-19 and 47-68; column 9, lines 22-32 and 45-51; column 16, lines 30-50). Sorenson teaches PCR amplification in an allele-specific manner to distinguish a normal gene to sequence from a mutated gene sequence (see column 2, lines 30-34

of Sorenson). Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve the method of haplotype identification taught by Landers to include PCR amplification of the nucleic acids in the enriched nucleic acid fraction with allele-specific primer sets that do not hybridize to portions of the nucleic acid that flank the first selected SNP site in view of the teachings of Sorenson to PCR amplification selectivity and sensitivity to ensure results of haplotype analysis did not show false results.

***Response to Arguments***

41. The response traverses the rejection. Applicant's arguments filed 6/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive.

42. The Applicant asserts that Landers provides no motivation to adapt the methods described therein to provide for isolation of allelic variants based on the specific sequence of all allele of one SNP site, and thereafter separately determine the identity of alleles and relative amounts of a second SNP site (Page 10 second paragraph). This argument has been reviewed but is not persuasive because Landers teaches Allele Specific Oligonucleotide (ASO)-mediated isolation of allelic variants based on the specific sequences (Figures 1, 2, 3A and 3B; column 9 lines 4-9; column 16 lines 44-50; claims 1-7). Landers also teaches purification or isolation of ASO-captured allele by "separating the labeled nucleic acid samples into single nucleic acid molecules, detecting the presence of absence of the first, second, third and fourth labeled probes" (column 4, lines 5-9). Landers further teaches a bi-physic allele specific oligonucleotide

hybridization techniques where (1) a SNP1 allele –specific oligonucleotide (ASO) is used to capture a SNP1/nucleic acid sample complex; (2) Excess un-hybridized DNA is removed to purify the first SNP1 allele-specific DNA; (3) SNP2 is analyzed. (column 14 lines 45-65). Landers further teaches a method in which after the first SNP has been identified, the DNA molecules containing the first allele are in a separate container from the DNA samples containing the second allele (column 16 lines 30-34).

43. The response asserts that the method is not limited by the distance of the SNPs. This argument has been reviewed but is not persuasive because the instant claims do not require any distance between SNPs. The claims encompass SNPs which are in close proximity as well as more distant. The teachings of Landers in view of Sorenson teach all limitations of the claims.

44. Applicant asserts that neither Landers nor Sorensen teaches desirability of first enriching based on the specific sequence of a particular allele of one selected SNP site. This argument has been reviewed bit is not persuasive because Landers teaches enrichment of specific sequences of a particular allele as discussed above. Applicant further states that neither Landers nor Sorensen suggests using a primer set that only flanks one SNP. However, Sorenson teaches that prior to determining the alleles present in a particular nucleic acid, the nucleic acid sample can be amplified with a common amplification step by PCR to amplify wild-type and mutant forms of the DNA to increase the amount of DNA from which the mutant allele can be detected (see column 2, lines 35-39) Sorenson specifically teaches that the amplification by PCR can either

be in an allele-specific manner to distinguish a normal gene sequence from a mutated gene sequence or to increase the total amount of DNA (column 2, lines 33-39).

**45. Conclusion**

**46. No claims are allowed.**

47. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dan-Sung Cho whose telephone number is (571) 272-9933. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dan-Sung C. Cho
Examiner
AU 1634

J. Goldberg
JEANINE A. GOLDBERG
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/21/06